



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,326	09/18/2000	Paul Habermann	02481.1693	4393
22852	7590	12/29/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			SCHNIZER, HOLLY G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,326

Applicant(s)

HABERMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Holly Schnizer

Art Unit

1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/15/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/15/05 has been entered.

Status of the Claims

The Amendment filed 7/15/05 has been entered and considered. Claims 6-9 are currently pending and have been considered in this Office Action.

Rejections Withdrawn

The rejection of Claims 6, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achstetter et al. in view of Schmid et al. is withdrawn in light of the amendment adding that the E. coli are not E. coli secretor mutants. Schmid et al. teach that E. coli secretor mutants were used in the assay disclosed therein and thus, the combination of Achstetter et al. and Schmid et al. no longer meets all the limitations of the claims.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The added limitation that the E. coli bacteria used in the process are not E. coli secretor mutants is considered new matter. Applicants contend that support is found in several passages in the Specification which are addressed as follows: page 9, lines 3-5 states that competent cells of the E. coli strain Mc1061 or the secretor mutant WCM100 were transformed with the ligation mixture and grown under selection pressure on ampicillin containing plates and that expression was compared with Ala-hirudin using the E. coli strain WCM100/pCM7053. However, the Specification does not indicate which E. coli strain (Mc1061 or WCM100) was used in these tests and which gave the expression that was 1.5 times better than the comparative test (Ala-hirudin expression using WCM100/pCM7053); page 9, lines 23-24, page 10, lines 18-20, and page 11, lines 19-20 all again refer to expression of hirudin with different signal peptides as

Art Unit: 1656

compared to Ala-hirudin expression using the E. coli strain WCM100/pCM7053. The Specification does not indicate that one E. coli strain would be better than another or that the E. coli strain is of importance. The object of the present Invention is to find a signal sequence that, when combined with Leu-hirudin, will permit direct processing to Leu-hirudin and subsequent secretion of native Leu-hirudin in optimal yields in E. coli in general (see for example p. 2, lines 19-24 and page 3, lines 1-2 which states that in order to find advantageous signal sequences). The Specification as a whole does not teach that the type of E. coli strain is important or that non-secretor mutants should be used. Therefore, since the Specification as a whole teaches that any E. coli strain could be used and is not important to the invention, the negative limitation that the E. coli bacteria are not E. coli secretor mutants is considered new matter. For the reasons stated above, it does not appear that, at the time of filing, Applicant contemplated the exclusion of E. coli secretor mutants from the process of the invention.

Conclusions


No Claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Schnizer whose telephone number is (571) 272-0958. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday from 10 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1656

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr can be reached on (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Holly Schnizer
December 22, 2005